

JUN 07 2001

LISA GUE: Thanks. My name is Lisa Gue, G-u-e. I'm work with Public Citizen. I'm here from Washington, D.C.. And first of all, I want to thank all of the people here from the community for coming here and their attention to this project and concern with the public participation avenues available. And also on a personal note, thank you for the welcome to Pahrump, Nevada.

1 In terms of commenting on the Supplement to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement let me first tell you where I'm coming from. Public Citizen is a national nonprofit consumer advocacy organization that closely follows issues of energy policy in Congress and the federal agencies. And we object in the strongest terms to the Yucca Mountain project, which we understand to lead the nation in the wrong direction completely in terms of sustainable energy goals, and in addition demonstrate many fatal flaws in and of itself as a project.

2 So to reiterate some of what has been said before, 45 days is simply not long enough. Public Citizen has also requested an extension to that comment period. A 45-day comment period effectively precludes the possibility of broad-based meaningful comments on this Supplement to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, given again the technical nature of the subject under consideration and the fact that it is summer schedule that a lot of us are operating under, and then again this issue of overlapping comment periods, which John Hadder has also mentioned.

3 Not only do the overlapping comment periods diminish the possibility for public participation in this process, it also gives the impression that the site recommendation process for Yucca Mountain is not referencing the Environmental Impact Statement process. Procedurally it undermines the integrity of the Department of Energy's processes to be moving ahead with reports that provide the document, the basis for a potential Site Recommendation while key aspects of an environmental impact assessment, such as the repository design, are still under review, and public comment on those design proposals have not even been gathered, let alone responded to.

Certainly the Environmental Impact Statement and all of its drafts and supplements should be concluded in a final way before any reports are issued and before public comment is solicited yet again on the specifics of a design proposal.

4... Next I want to say for the record the issue that I raised during the comment period, and that is with continued evolving design of the Yucca Mountain proposal. And there's two aspects to my comment on this point. First of all, the very appearance of the Supplement to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement recognizes the issue that this evolving design procedure puts onto the table, which is that the original design characteristics for the repository that were analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement or no longer an accurate representation of the repository proposal that's currently being discussed.

- 4 cont. However, because the Department of Energy has still not specified exactly what they are proposing in a clear and final way, the Supplement in effect does not address the root of those problems. To say that in a different way, it's entirely possible that within a year or within five years the repository design proposal could have changed again, and again we would be in the situation of having no accurate Environmental Impact Assessment of the actual design proposal of the repository that would be built.

This is a serious problem. The Department of Energy needs to specify which repository design they are considering and complete and rewrite the Environmental Impact Statement as a draft in consideration of those design specifics. To do otherwise clearly undermines the spirit of NEPA and the whole procedure for drafting, the whole reason behind drafting an Environmental Impact Statement.

- 5 And then secondly, just very quickly, clearly there are other aspects of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that has changed and will continue to change since the draft was released. Transportation significantly needs to be rewritten, and hearings on this issue need to be held in the communities that would be affected, some of which were not identified by the draft but now are likely to be affected by transportation.

To conclude, from the perspective of public health and safety, these issues should be of serious concern because we do not know at the end of the day, we do not have an assessment of the environmental impacts of the repository proposal.

- 6 In addition, in terms of responsible and responsive energy policy, this also raises significant concerns in terms of a flawed process that continues to characterize the Yucca Mountain proposal which seems to be designed to allow a dangerous and discredited project to move forward.

Thank you.